



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/466,279	12/17/1999	HAJIME INOUE	SONYJP-3.0-0	9975
530	7590	11/26/2003	EXAMINER	
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			SHELTON, BRIAN K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	5
		2611		

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/466,279	INOUE ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian Shelton	Art Unit 2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 1999.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshino.

As for claim 1, Yoshino discloses a receiving apparatus for a digital broadcasting for receiving a digital broadcasting which is transmitted by a transport stream in which video data and audio data have been compressed and multiplexed (IRD 102; see col. 3, lines 29-36 where IRD 102 is described as a digital satellite broadcasting receiver inherently receiving compressed and multiplexed data), comprising:

- (a) a decoder for decoding said transport stream (video processing section 303; see col. 4, lines 17-24);
- (b) a digital interface for mutually transmitting and receiving the transport stream to/from digital signal processing devices (digital connection interface 304; see col. 4, lines 13-24; see also); and

(c) a register for selecting a predetermined number of devices among a plurality of digital signal processing devices connected to said digital interface (col. 4, lines 38-47, disclosing connected device memory) and allocating identification numbers to said selected devices (col. 4, lines 38-47, disclosing communication function pair memory; see col. 10, lines 3-9 disclosing selection of multiple communication pairs; see also col. 5, lines 19-21 discussing assignment of device ID numbers).

Method claim 11 is rejected for the same rationale underlying the rejection of corresponding apparatus claim 1.

As for claim 5, Yoshino discloses an apparatus wherein the register can change the contents of registration by a user input (col. 8, lines 10-25, describing user selection of a source device; col. 8, lines 26-35 describing selection of a target device).

Method claim 15 is rejected for the same rationale underlying the rejection of corresponding apparatus claim 5.

As for claim 10, Yoshino discloses an apparatus comprising display means for displaying a selection screen to select devices from said registered

devices (Figs. 13 and 15; col. 8, lines 10-25, describing user selection of a source device; col. 8, lines 26-35 describing selection of a target device).

Method claim 20 is rejected for the same rationale underlying the rejection of corresponding apparatus claim 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-4, 6-9, 12-14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshino in view of Koyama.

As for claim 2, Yoshino discloses an apparatus wherein the register stores identification numbers allocated to the selected digital processing devices (col. 4, lines 38-47, discussing storage of device name and ID numbers, including communication pair function memory and communication configuration memory). However, Yoshino fails to disclose maintaining a registration, whether the selected digital signal processing devices has been connected to the digital interface or not.

Koyama, though disclosing maintaining a registration (col. 5, lines 34-38, discussing correlation of node ID and unique ID of connected devices and storage of node ID and unique ID data pairs in memory), whether the selected devices have been connected to the digital interface or not (see col. 6, lines 34-45 discussing comparison of unique ID values with node ID values following a bus reset; see col. 7, lines 8-11 discussing reconnection of a previously connected device) for the advantage of allowing a device connected to a network to be temporarily removed from the network without necessitating reconfiguration of the network upon reconnection of said device.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Yoshino to include maintaining a registration, whether the selected digital signal processing devices has been connected to the digital interface or not, as taught by Koyama, for the advantage of allowing a device connected to a network to be temporarily removed from the network without necessitating reconfiguration of the network upon reconnection of said device.

Method claim 12 is rejected for the same rationale underlying the rejection of corresponding apparatus claim 2.

Regarding claim 3, Yoshino and Koyama are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to claim 2. The limitation of claim 3 is encompassed

by the teachings of Yoshino in view of Koyama. Specifically, Koyama teaches a register which confirms whether a device which is connected has already been registered with the identification number or not the device is connected to the digital interface (see col. 6, lines 34-45 discussing comparison of unique ID values with node ID values following a bus reset; see col. 7, lines 8-11 discussing reconnection of a previously connected device).

Method claim 13 is rejected for the same rationale underlying the rejection of corresponding apparatus claim 3.

Regarding claim 4, Yoshino and Koyama are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to claim 2. The limitation of claim 4 is encompassed by the teachings of Yoshio in view of Koyama Specifically, Koyama discloses a register that automatically registers the predetermined number of devices which were first connected among the devices connected to the digital interface (see col. 6, lines 46-50 discussing use of reassignment of node ID to reset node ID following a bus reset; see also col. 7, lines 7-11 describing the case of automatic registration where a connected device was previously connected; compare to col. 7. lines 12-20, describing case where a “newly added device” is connected).

Method claim 14 is rejected for the same rationale underlying the rejection of corresponding apparatus claim 4.

Regarding claim 6, Yoshino and Koyama are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to claim 2. The limitation of claim 6 is encompassed by the teachings of Yoshino in view of Koyama. Specifically, Koyama discloses a register which prohibits cancellation of a registration where connected devices are among equipment which have previously been registered (see col. 6, lines 34-45 discussing comparison of unique ID values with node ID values following a bus reset; see col. 7, lines 8-11 discussing reconnection of a previously connected device, wherein the unique ID corresponding to a previously connected device is used to change the node ID to the reset node ID in table file 601; see col. 7, lines 20-28, wherein the display position of display information corresponding to a previously connected (i.e., registered) device is maintained following the disconnection of the device from the bus; see also col. 7, lines 55-58 and Figs. 11A and 11B wherein the display position of a previously registered device is maintained following its disconnection from the network. By contrast, if the register disclosed by Koyama to the case were not employed, personal computer 104 would be unable to ascertain whether a device connected to the digital interface had been previously connected following a bus resetting event; (i.e., the removal of a device from a 1394 interface results in a bus reset, wherein the node ID numbers of devices are reassigned, so a device that appeared to PC 104 at node ID 3 could appear as if were connected at node ID 1 following a bus reset. PC 104 would be unable to ascertain whether the device had been

previously connected, and the registration of the connected device would be cancelled. The registration process disclosed by Koyama avoids such a result and, thus, prohibits the cancellation of a previously connected device.) see col. 4, lines 21-31).

As for claim 7, Yoshino and Koyama are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to claim 2. The limitation of claim 7 is encompassed by the teachings of Yoshino in view of Koyama. Specifically, Koyama discloses a display processing circuit for displaying a list of registered devices (Fig. 5; see col. 5, lines 48-57 describing output of the display device which includes icons 501, 502 and 503 indicating connected devices).

Method claim 17 is rejected for the same rationale underlying the rejection of corresponding apparatus claim 7.

As for claim 8, Yoshino and Koyama are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to claim 7. The limitation of claim 8 is encompassed by the teachings of Yoshino in view of Koyama. Specifically, Koyama discloses displaying the list of registered devices displays so that the devices connected to the digital interface and the devices which are not connected among the registered devices can be visually discriminated (Fig. 8; col. 6, lines 59-62,

describing displaying the icon representing a disconnected device more vaguely than other icons).

Method claim 18 is rejected for the same rationale underlying the rejection of corresponding apparatus claim 8.

As for claim 9, Yoshino and Koyama are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to claim 7. The limitation of claim 9 is encompassed by the teachings of Yoshino in view of Koyama. Specifically, Koyama discloses a display processing circuit that performs a predetermined warning display when a changing operation of the registration is performed in which the connected devices are among devices which have previously been registered by the register (see Fig. 11A describing display output for the situation where devices DVC101, DVC102, and DVC103 are connected; see Fig. 11B and display corresponding to removal of DVC102 and the associated "COMMUNICATION IMPOSSIBLE" warning message; see col. 7, lines 55-65).

Method claim 19 is rejected for the same rationale underlying the rejection of corresponding apparatus claim 9.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 17 July 2003 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Conclusion

6. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) _____ - _____ on _____.
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Shelton whose telephone number is (703) 305-8714. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the primary examiner, Christopher Grant can be reached on (703) 305-4755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Brian Shelton
Examiner
Art Unit 2611

BS


CHRIS GRANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER